United Nations A/C.3/65/SR.42

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
7 January 2011

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 4 November 2010, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)

Contents

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

10-62094 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

1. **Mr. Nihon** (Belgium), speaking also on behalf of Armenia, Mexico, Senegal and Thailand, the main sponsors of Human Rights Council resolution 12/15 on regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights, said that a recent workshop in Geneva had resulted in the identification of concrete ways to further strengthen cooperation between the United Nations and regional mechanisms in the field of human rights. The corresponding report (A/HRC/15/56) provided a detailed summary of the proceedings.

2. Following up on the workshop, the sponsors had concluded that the Human Rights Council was the most appropriate forum to bring different actors in the field of human rights together. They had therefore decided to introduce the next action-oriented resolution on that topic at the eighteenth session of the Council, rather than presenting the traditional biennial resolution in the General Assembly.

3. The sponsors welcomed the recent report of the Secretary-General on regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights (A/65/369), which highlighted the need to reinforce cooperation between international and regional human rights mechanisms, and to appoint focal points in each of those mechanisms in order to maintain regular communication.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.29: Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

4. **Ms. Fröberg** (Finland) said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Georgia and Guatemala had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which was traditionally presented by Finland or Sweden on behalf of the five Nordic countries on a biennial basis.

5. The new elements in the draft resolution were based on the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. They included situations where prisoners controlled prisons and the need to prevent and end such situations; the need to undertake systematic studies of vigilante killings in order to take context-specific and focused action to prevent and end them; and a proposal to convene an expert consultation to discuss the current and potential human rights applications of new technologies and the risks and obstacles to their effective use.

6. **The Chair** said that the Dominican Republic and the Republic of Moldova had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.34: Protection of migrants

7. **Mr. González Segura** (Mexico) said that Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Paraguay and Senegal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which was based on the text adopted in 2009, with the addition of some concepts taken from the resolution on the same issue recently adopted by the Human Rights Council. New elements had been introduced to strengthen political commitments as well as the international system for the protection of the human rights of migrants. In that regard, the draft resolution acknowledged the international community's concerns about the impact of the crisis on migrants, particularly migrant workers and their families, and referred to the vulnerable situation of migrants in the face of organized crime, urging States to take the necessary measures. It also emphasized that the human rights perspective should be considered a priority in future meetings on international migration and development.

8. The sponsors also considered it important to refer to the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and called on the Secretary-General to explain how the Convention had influenced protection measures in his report on the question.

9. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Belarus, Benin, Chile, El Salvador, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, the Philippines and Tajikistan.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.35: Human rights in the administration of justice

10. **Mr. Vollmer** (Austria) said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Georgia, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta,

Monaco, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Spain and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

11. The draft resolution took into account key relevant developments, such as the recommendations of the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the adoption by the Committee of the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders. It focused on juvenile justice and women and children affected by the detention of their primary caregivers. The draft resolution also reflected the importance of including rehabilitation and reintegration strategies for juvenile offenders in juvenile justice policies.

12. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Seychelles and Uruguay.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.37: Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members

13. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan) said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Andorra, Belgium, Colombia, Finland, Indonesia, Israel, Poland, Portugal, Turkey and Viet Nam.

14. Leprosy was among the world's oldest and most dreaded diseases; however, since the early 1980s, an effective cure had become available. Nevertheless, many people continued to believe that it was a highly contagious, incurable or hereditary disease, leading to the stigmatization and discrimination of those affected. Earlier in the year, the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee had submitted "Principles and Guidelines for the Elimination of Discrimination against Persons Affected by Leprosy and Their Family Members" to the Council.

15. The draft resolution sought to draw the attention of all Member States to the issue and encouraged all relevant actors to give due consideration to the Principles and Guidelines.

16. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Albania, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Jordan, Mali, Nicaragua, the Republic of Moldova and Romania.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.39: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

17. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking as coordinator of the working group on human rights of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that China and El Salvador had joined the list of sponsors.

18. The draft resolution reflected the Movement's opinion on unilateral coercive measures and their negative impact on the realization of all human rights, particularly the right to development.

19. The draft resolution urged States not to adopt such measures, which were incompatible with international law and the principles governing peaceful coexistence between States. The adoption of the draft resolution would send a strong message against extraterritorial coercive measures that threatened the sovereignty of Member States, deploring the continued unilateral application of such measures to exert political and economic pressure, especially against developing countries. Countries were urged to end such measures immediately, bearing in mind their obligations under the human rights treaties to which they were party and other instruments of international law. In addition, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights should prepare a report on the impact of unilateral coercive measures on the full enjoyment of human rights.

20. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Egypt, Kuwait and the Philippines.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.40: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

21. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking as coordinator of the working group on Human Rights of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that China and El Salvador had joined the list of sponsors and underlined that the outcome document of the XV Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had made reference to the draft resolution on enhancing international cooperation for human rights, which was introduced each year.

22. The purpose of the draft resolution was to recognize that it was essential to achieve fully the objectives of the United Nations, including the promotion and protection of all human rights. It had

been modified to reflect technical innovations and to emphasize the role of international cooperation in supporting national efforts to enhance human rights.

23. **The Chair** said that the Philippines had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.41: The right to development

24. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking as coordinator of the working group on human rights of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that China and El Salvador had joined the list of sponsors.

25. The outcome document of the XV Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had reflected the agreement reached to promote a greater acceptance, application and realization of the right to development at the global level. On that basis, every year the Movement presented the draft resolution to the Third Committee. The current text placed particular emphasis on the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Declaration of the Right to Development in 2011. In addition, the text had been updated to incorporate the relevant language adopted at the most recent session of the Human Rights Council, including references to the work of the Working Group on the Right to Development.

26. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the list of sponsors: Angola, Kuwait and the Philippines.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.42: The right to food

27. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Bahamas, Belize, Bhutan, Chile, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Turkmenistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen and Zambia.

28. Despite the fact that the right to food had been extensively recognized in human rights instruments and declarations, it continued to be a utopia for many. Owing to the world food crisis, the number of people who went hungry had increased dramatically, mostly in the developing world. The draft resolution reaffirmed that hunger was a violation of human dignity requiring the adoption of urgent measures at the national, regional and international levels and the mobilization of the resources of the United Nations, other international organizations and all States to ensure food security for all.

29. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Armenia, Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, the Niger, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.44: Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all

30. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors, said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: El Salvador, Ethiopia, Grenada, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

31. The draft resolution reaffirmed that all the peoples of the world had a right to peace. The conservation of that right was a fundamental obligation of States, which were urged to respect and implement the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in their relations with other States, without any discrimination, based on the latter's political, economic or social system. It also emphasized the crucial importance of education for peace and urged States, specialized agencies of the United Nations and non-governmental organizations to play an active role to that end.

32. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Benin, Cameroon, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Namibia and Vanuatu.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.45: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

33. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors, said

that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Ethiopia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Uzbekistan. The draft resolution, which was submitted to the Committee every year, was particularly important in view of the current economic and financial crisis, which had had a devastating impact on developing countries, even though they were not responsible for it.

34. The United Nations must work urgently to establish a global economic order based on equity, the sovereign equality of States, interdependence, common interests and international cooperation among all the States irrespective of their economic and social systems. The few modifications introduced in the draft resolution referred to the contribution that the dialogue between religions, culture and civilizations could make to strengthening international cooperation at all levels.

35. **The Chair** said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Benin, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Honduras, India, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, the Niger, Swaziland and Vanuatu.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.47: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

36. **Mr. Lambert** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Micronesia (Federated States of) and Tuvalu had become sponsors. While the draft resolution took note of some positive steps recently taken by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including its participation in the universal periodic review process and efforts to reunite families separated by the border with the Republic of Korea, substantive changes in the human rights situation were still lacking. As in earlier resolutions on the issue, the draft resolution urged the Government to put an end to systematic and grave violations of human rights and ensure the immediate return of victims of enforced disappearance. As in previous years, the Government had refused to engage in discussions of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.48: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

37. **Mr. Lambert** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel and the Republic of Korea had joined as sponsors. The draft resolution, which was based on the reports of the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur on the situation for human rights in Myanmar, reflected their serious concerns for the human rights situation in the country. His delegation appreciated the Government of Myanmar's willingness to hold discussions during the drafting of the text. Such consultations should be maintained through continued consideration of the draft resolution, which would be amended prior to its adoption in order to take into account developments resulting from the imminent national elections.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.49: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

38. **Mr. Rivard** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, said that Andorra, Croatia, Micronesia (Federated States of) and Palau had become sponsors. The draft resolution included concerns noted in the Secretary-General's report (A/65/370), submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/176, adopted the previous year. It requested that the Secretary-General should once again report on the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran to both the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly.

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.17/Rev.2: Intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women

39. **Mr. Gonnet** (France), speaking also on behalf of the Netherlands, said that Ecuador and Guatemala had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution, to which two revisions had been made. The following text should be added to the end of the fourth preambular paragraph: "and noting the attention paid to the elimination of all forms of violence against indigenous women in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 61/295 of 13 September 2007,". In the seventh preambular paragraph, the phrase "in which

the Council established a working group of independent experts on the issue of discrimination against women in law and practice" should be deleted.

40. The draft resolution reaffirmed the General Assembly resolutions adopted in the previous two years and placed special emphasis on the prevention of violence and the need for coordination of efforts between Member States and the United Nations system, a task that would require the issue to be considered on a biannual basis. As in past years, the sponsors had sought consensus on the draft resolution by omitting mention of any specific form of violence against women or of any group that was particularly vulnerable to violence. The sponsors had also demonstrated a flexible approach in the negotiation process in order to ensure balance on a subject that was important to all States. Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution reflected the concern of the sponsors regarding the possible misuse of customs, traditions or religious considerations, which were at times invoked to justify violence against women. It was the obligation of all States to combat violence against women, as had been underscored in the Beijing Platform for Action.

41. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Grenada, Guyana, India, Liberia, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu, Seychelles and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

42. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that, in response to the unilateral approach taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution to negotiations on the text, the Group had presented amendments to document A/C.3/65/L.17/Rev.1, which had been consolidated in document A/C.3/65/L.28. While the current amended version of the draft resolution had only partially addressed outstanding concerns, the Group recognized that it must remain flexible in order to promote consensus on the issue. The elimination of all forms of violence against women fell within the purview of all Governments and of the international community as a whole; it was not the sole domain of a few countries. He urged the sponsors to fulfil their role as facilitators in order to achieve the broadest accession possible to resolutions in the future.

43. **Mr. El Mkhantar** (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that while the Group had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it was regrettable that its concerns about its paragraph 8 had been ignored. Although the wording of that paragraph was very similar to wording used in the Beijing Platform for Action at the Fourth World Conference on Women, the latter, which had been conceived as an integrated unit whose elements must not be addressed on a selective basis, had also stressed the importance of respecting national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious differences. The Arab Group had thus proposed an alternative paragraph which would have stressed the importance of combating violence against women as a result of harmful traditional practices, cultural intolerance and extremism. The Group's understanding of paragraph 8 was that it did not, under any circumstances, imply that religions incited violence against women.

44. **Mr. Bené** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation had also expressed misgivings about the wording of paragraph 8, which could be read to imply that religion called for violence against women. Religion could, in fact, promote the authentic advancement of women; a distinction needed to be made between the misuse of religion and religion itself. People of all faiths must condemn gender-based violence.

45. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that a clear distinction should be made between harmful practices and traditional values. While the former should be condemned, the latter made positive contribution. Traditional values had, to a large extent, served as the source of the current understanding of human rights and freedoms. Sponsors should take such distinctions into account and avoid conflating those concepts and artificially provoking confrontation in the Committee. The ambiguous reference to religion seemed inappropriate. Overall, his delegation regretted the approach taken by the sponsors on the draft resolution.

46. **Ms. Tawk** (Lebanon) said that her country had been listed as a sponsor in error and should therefore be deleted from the draft resolution.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.17/Rev.2, as orally revised, was adopted.*

48. **Ms. Fries-Gaier** (Germany), also speaking on behalf of Italy and Poland, said that human trafficking was increasingly a major feature of transnational organized crime. In that regard, the fundamental and legally binding international human rights instruments to combat that phenomenon were the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, particularly the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children. The three delegations called for the universal ratification and full and effective implementation of those instruments. Moreover, the Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking constituted an important framework for protecting victims of trafficking and safeguarding their human rights.

49. **Ms. Abubakar** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) recalled that while her country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had not changed its position with regard to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

50. **Ms. Abdelrahman** (Sudan) said that, although her country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it was regrettable that some had taken a selective and extremist approach in the negotiations on its wording. She regretted the fact that the draft resolution had not made clearer references to global instruments on human trafficking and strongly believed that its reference to religion and violence against women was ambiguous and unacceptable. Moreover, her country distanced itself from the draft resolution's references to the International Criminal Court. As some Member States were not State Parties to the Rome Statute of that Court and did not acknowledge its jurisdiction, those references had not facilitated consensus-building. It was unacceptable that draft resolutions submitted to the Committee for adoption implied that States should accede to the Court, which had come to symbolize the politicization of justice.

51. **Ms. Méndez Romero** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that eliminating all forms of violence against women and protecting women's rights was of the utmost priority to her Government, as demonstrated by an innovative national law on women's right to live free from violence, domestic courts specializing in issues of gender-based violence and a range of State mechanisms for the protection of women's rights. Her delegation was pleased that the sponsors had decided to reinstate the references to the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the need to eliminate all forms of violence and discrimination against indigenous women, which had been included in previous years. Excluding indigenous women from the draft resolution would have been a discriminatory gesture. Indeed, her delegation would have appreciated a further reference to indigenous women's right to live free from violence.

52. For the second consecutive year, her delegation had chosen not to sponsor the draft resolution, although it had done so in all previous years to show the importance that it attached to the issue. However, her delegation had serious reservations to the reference in paragraph 24 to the Bretton Woods institutions and their alleged support for national efforts to eliminate violence against women. It was precisely the misguided policies and unjust conditions imposed by those institutions that restricted Governments' capacity for social spending, thereby promoting conditions that rendered women vulnerable to violence, including poverty and marginalization.

53. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) commended the efforts exerted by the draft resolution's sponsors to accommodate some of the African Group's core concerns. However, his delegation shared the concerns of the Arab Group and the Holy See with regard to paragraph 8. In that connection, misuse and misinterpretation of religion was the problem, not religion itself, which had served to enhance the dignity of women for centuries. A spirit of cooperation should prevail in future negotiations as that would facilitate the adoption of texts which reflected the views of all stakeholders.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.19/Rev.1: International Widows' Day

54. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

55. **Mr. Issoze-Ngondet** (Gabon) said that Australia, Azerbaijan, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, France, the Gambia, Ghana, India, Finland, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nigeria, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

56. Widows had a legitimate right to lead a dignified life. In negotiations on the text of the draft resolution, the sponsors had appreciated input by stakeholders to

ensure that it more effectively addressed the situation of widows and their children in all countries.

57. **Mr. Gustavik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Albania, Belarus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal and Slovenia had also joined the sponsors.

58. **Ms. Wilson** (Jamaica) said that an enhanced focus on widows and children could facilitate the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women as well as other human rights instruments that advanced the empowerment of women and children. Since women, on average, lived longer than men, they required lifelong support systems. Many widows and their children lived in poverty. They were frequently the victims of prejudice and discrimination and also suffered from high infection rates of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. Moreover, millions of widows' children suffered from malnutrition, inadequate schooling and illiteracy and were particularly vulnerable to abuse, exploitation and human trafficking. International Widows' Day would help highlight the situation of widows and their children, including those living in rural areas. Moreover, it could help raise men's awareness of their plight and encourage their participation in efforts to improve their lives. In that connection, Jamaica had established a male desk in its Bureau of Women's Affairs to integrate the concerns of men and facilitate dialogue between men and women with a view to formulating strategies to eliminate gender-based violence.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.26/Rev.1: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

60. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

61. **Ms. Raabyemagle** (Denmark), introducing the draft resolution with a minor drafting change, announced that Angola, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Israel, Mali, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the list of sponsors. The absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was one of the fundamental principles to which all Member States of the United Nations subscribed. That was stated in simple and unqualified terms in article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and had been reaffirmed in all relevant subsequent human rights instruments. Nevertheless, the Special Rapporteur continued to report on torture in all parts of the world. In part because of universal agreement that such acts were inexcusable and indefensible, they took place in secret and despite official denial. The General Assembly therefore had a particular responsibility to speak out.

62. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Timor-Leste and Togo had also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.26/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

64. **Mr. Pak** Tok Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation completely rejected the draft resolution introduced by Belgium on behalf of the European Union as a product of politicization and human rights double standards. The European Union had begun introducing its resolution against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in 2003, just two months after withdrawal by that country from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The draft resolution was clearly politically motivated, a plot and a fabrication, and had nothing to do with human rights.

65. The alleged human rights violations described in the draft resolution could not exist in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, where human rights and fundamental freedoms were firmly guaranteed by the legal system and in practice. In presenting the draft resolution, the principal purpose of the European Union and its allies was to distort the human rights situation in the country and to overthrow its socialist system.

66. The main sponsors of the draft resolution committed human rights violations by engaging in armed aggression against sovereign States and carrying out massacres of civilians in the guise of a "war on terror". Their attempt to mislead world opinion was preposterous. In their own territories there were serious human rights violations, such as racial discrimination,

mistreatment of immigrants and blasphemy. They had also plundered developing countries in the past while carrying out colonial policies. The main sponsors of the draft resolution should reflect upon their records of human rights violations and take immediate corrective measures before slandering other countries.

67. His delegation also opposed and rejected all other country-specific draft resolutions, as they fostered confrontation and distrust in the international human rights arena.

68. **Mr. Alibabaee** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed deep regret with regard to the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Canada on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. It was obvious to all present that the draft resolution had nothing to do with human rights, but was a politically motivated exercise, designed to serve the narrow political purposes and interests of Canada and the other sponsors. It did not correspond to the actual human rights situation in Iran, and it contained flawed, inaccurate and exaggerated claims and unfounded allegations to which his delegation would respond in due time. It lacked credibility and objectivity in terms of both substance and procedure.

69. If Canada was truly concerned about human rights, it should first try to correct its own human rights records, as Canada and other sponsors of the draft resolution were themselves implicated in serious human rights violations. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had expressed concerns that minority groups in Canada continued to face discrimination in all walks of life. There was dramatic inequality between the living standards of Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians. Women of colour in Canada were overrepresented in prisons and suffered from a high level of discrimination and violence. The move by Canada to present a country-specific draft resolution was an abuse of United Nations human rights mechanisms for political purposes.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.